

REMARKS

Claims 3-7, 10 and 12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3-7, 10 and 12 are amended, and claims 8, 9, 11 and 13-14 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Claims 3-7 and 10 are amended for dependency and for antecedent basis. For example, support for amendments to claims 3-6 may be found in the specification, for example, at paragraphs [0124] and [0125]. Claim 12 is amended for antecedent basis and form. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amend claims 3-7 and 10 to depend from claim 12, which is allowable for the reasons discussed below; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen at the telephone interview held June 28, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. June 20, 2007 Advisory Action & June 28, 2007 Telephone Interview

The June 20, 2007 Advisory Action states that "the new amended claims would raise a 112 problem." As agreed during the telephone interview, if the claims are amended to correct the "112 problem" the amended claims would be entered. Accordingly, entrance of the amendments are respectfully requested.

II. The §103(a) Rejection is Moot

Claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamanaka. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 11 and the amendments to claims 4, 5 and 10 to depend from claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Double Patenting Rejection is Withdrawn

Claims 3-12 are rejected under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,950,308 to Saitoh et al. However, the June 20, 2007 Advisory Action has withdrawn the double patenting rejection in view of the terminal disclaimer filed June 4, 2007.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: July 5, 2007
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--